



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/526,441	03/16/2000	Kamran Ahmed	I0442-4"US" JA/mb JA/mb	2595
20988	7590	01/09/2003		
OGILVY RENAULT 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE SUITE 1600 MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3 CANADA			EXAMINER [REDACTED]	BRIER, JEFFERY A
			ART UNIT 2672	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/526,441	AHMED, KAMRAN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	Jeffery A. Brier	2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 28 October 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/02/02 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The 10/28/02 after final amendment has been entered in response to applicants request to do so in the Request for RCE transmittal. This amendment overcomes the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claim 12 and the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 6-12 and 31.

### ***Drawings***

3. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 12/02/02 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(a)(6) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of two Zoom Front Buffers and one Zoom Back Buffer as shown in the unmarked copy of figure 6. The original disclosure does not support the showing of Zoom Buffer, Zoom Front Buffer, and Zoom Back Buffer as shown in the marked up copy of figure 6. Applicants arguments at page 2 of the 12/02/02 response have been

considered but since it is not clear what kind of Zoom Buffer (Front or Back or just zoom) is the third zoom buffer, applicants argument is not persuasive. Applicant should review the common terms used to refer to the zoom buffers in a triple buffer system and apply them to this proposed figure.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The description of figure 4 was deleted by the 6/27/02 amendment of the paragraph starting at page 9 line 10;

The description at page 3 lines 10-13 and page 11 line 25 describes a non-integer fraction, however, this does not seem to be accurate. For example a fraction of  $1/4.1$  is also  $10/41$  which is an integer fraction since by applicants definition the denominator determines if the fraction is non-integer and 41 is an integer; and

The 06/27/02 amendment amended the paragraph at page 8 line 10, the word "resolutions" at line 6 should be "resolution".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Response to Amendment***

5. The amendment filed 06/27/02 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the sentence added to

the paragraph beginning at page 7 line 28 is new matter, see page 2 of the appendix lines 4-5.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

6. The amendments filed 06/27/02 and 10/28/02 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the sentence added at the beginning of the paragraph beginning at page 11 line 12 is new matter, see page 3 of the 06/27/02 appendix and page 11 of the 10/28/02 response.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

7. The amendment filed 12/02/02 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the sentence added at the end of the paragraph beginning at page 4 line 13 is new matter, see page 5 of the 12/02/02 response.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

### ***Claim Objections***

8. Claims 13 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 13 line 2 "two displays outputs" should be "two display outputs. Claim 28 line 3 "resolution!" is a not a word. Appropriate correction is required.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/02 and 10/28/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The argument concerning claims 5 and 25, page 3 of the 12/02/02 response, have been considered but since the claims have been written such that they do not correspond to the detailed description of applicants invention then these claims are still deemed to be non-enabled by applicants disclosure.

The argument concerning Ranganathan, page 3 of the 12/02/02 response, is not persuasive because presently the claims claim a "display controller system having a main surface of the frame buffer". Since, the claim does not require the main surface to be in the frame buffer, the display controller does not have to have a frame buffer, and since the term main surface is defined by applicant at page 2 lines 15-22 to be the contents of the memory of which a portion is displayed, thus, graphics memory 56 of Ranganathan stores a main surface of which a portion is displayed (graphics pixels and movie pixels, column 5 lines 56-64) and when the user selects a movie the user is defining coordinates of a fixed position frame portion (this claim is written more broadly than what applicant has described in the specification, nonetheless the examiner is bound to give the claims the broadest reasonable meaning) within said main surface.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims claim dragging or moving the user selected portion over said main surface of the frame buffer memory by movement of the cursor. The specification enables selecting a different portion of the image but does not enable moving the image within the main surface of the frame buffer memory. Applicant needs to amend claims 5 and 25 to claim that which was described and enabled in the specification.

12. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, and 25 were amended by applicant in the 10/28/02 amendment to claim a "display controller system having a main surface of the frame buffer". This is broader than the previous limitation of a "display controller system having a frame buffer" since, the claim does not require the main surface to be in the frame buffer and this limitation is different than what was described in the originally filed specification. The originally

filed claims claimed a "display controller system having a main surface memory" and this limitation was amended in the 06/27/02 amendment to claim a "display controller system having a frame buffer". The originally filed specification described at page 3 line 16 a "display controller system having a main surface memory" and described at page 6 lines 25-27 fetching one or more display surfaces from a single frame buffer memory (50). The claims now claim a "display controller system having a main surface of the frame buffer" and this was clearly not conveyed as applicants invention in the originally filed specification.

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 5 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 is indefinite because claim 1 fixes the portion while claim 5 moves the portion.

Claim 15:

This claim is indefinite because at line 3 "said main display surface" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim 19:

This claim is indefinite because at line 3 "said main display surface" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Claims 16-18 depend upon claim 15 and do not correct the above identified problem associated with claim 15. Claim 20 depends upon claim 19 and does not correct the above identified problem associated with claim 19.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-24, and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ranganathan, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,201.

Claims 1 and 21:

Ranganathan describes a system that allows the user to select an application that has a movie window (figure 3). This act of selecting a movie selects a portion of the main surface because at column 12 lines 18-19 the movie is stored in a separate portion of the graphics memory 56 and since applicant described main surface in the originally filed specification at page 2 lines 15-22 to be the contents of the memory of which a portion is displayed. A scaler 64 scales the movie to fit the resolution of the monitor 24. Both the frame buffer and scaler reside within the display controller system. Column 7 lines 48-50 describes a graphics screen with a smaller window of a movie and column 8 lines 63-66 describes scaling the movie and displaying the scaled movie on monitor 24.

Claims 2 and 22:

Note hardware cursor generator 53 of Ranganathan.

Claims 3 and 23:

Note column 8 lines 60-66 of Ranganathan. Interpolation does reduce coarseness of expanded images.

Claims 4 and 24:

Note Ranganathan's column 8 line 65 which describes duplication which causes coarse pixels and interpolation which causes less coarse pixels.

Claims 6 and 9-11:

These claims claim using a drawing engine of the display controller to scale the portion into a buffer. Inherently Ranganathan's system has a drawing engine which renders a scaled version of the contents of the graphics memory 56 (including the portion selected by the user) into main surface of the frame buffer, note column 12 lines 18-19. The claims do not state when the scaling is performed and they do not definitely set forth that the drawing engine is in the display controller and since from the claim the drawing engine may be with the operating system while being of the display controller when it writes to the main surface of the frame buffer.

Claim 7:

Ranganathan's scaler 64 corresponds to applicants described and claimed backend scaler.

Claim 12:

Ranganathan's system allows the user to toggle between graphics and movie.

Claim 13:

Ranganathan's column 12 lines 18-19 describes displaying from the frame buffer the graphics on LCD 22 and the movie from a portion of the frame buffer on monitor 24, thus, essentially all of the frame buffer is displayed on LCD 22.

Claim 14:

Ranganathan's scaler 64 converts the movie to fit the resolution of monitor 24, note column 8 lines 59-66 and column 12 lines 45-52.

Claims 15-20:

Ranganathan's system allows any number of portions of the main display to be zoomed onto to the zoom display (monitor 24), graphics or movie. Thus, Ranganathan's system meets these claim limitations.

Claim 26:

Ranganathan's system inherently uses a drawing engine to draw the images including the part of the image including the movie into the frame buffer.

Claim 27:

Not column 8 line 60 of Ranganathan.

Claims 28 and 31:

Ranganathan determines or as applicants claims chooses the resolution of the zoom display, note column 12 lines 43-52.

Claims 29 and 32:

Ranganathan's system displays on the LCD a full screen and on the monitor a full screen, note column 7 lines 51-65 and column 8 lines 57-66.

Claims 30 and 33:

Ranganathan's zoom display is monitor 24 which is a CRT.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,201. In Ranganathan's system the cursor is selected by muxes 32, 42 and it is not scaled, however, scaling would be desirable if monitor 24 is high resolution and the cursor is low resolution, thus, without scaling the cursor will appear small on the high resolution monitor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention to scale the cursor in Ranganathan's display controller in order make the cursor legible on a high resolution monitor because column 12 lines 50-51 of Ranganathan suggests this by writing "Interpolation of pixels and lines may also be used to adjust the display size." In conjunction with the writing at column 12 lines 43-44 "When image of different resolutions are to be displayed on both the CRT and flat panel".

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery A. Brier whose telephone number is (703) 305-4723. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Jeffery A Brier  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2672